

**West Virginia  
Clean Water State Revolving Fund**



**Fiscal  
Year  
2011**

# **Intended Use Plan**

Submitted to the  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Region III  
September , 2010



**west virginia department of environmental protection**

---

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

Glossary.....	3
Preface.....	4
SECTION I	
Introduction.....	5
SECTION II	
Funds Identification.....	5
SECTION III	
Goals.....	8
SECTION IV	
Project Priority List.....	10
SECTION V	
Fund Activities.....	11
SECTION VI	
Assurances .....	20
SECTION VII	
Criteria and Method for Distribution of Funds .....	21
SECTION VIII	
Public Participation.....	21
SECTION IX	
Agreement.....	22

## Appendices

- A - CWSRF Federal Capitalization Awards to WV
- B - FY 2011 Priority List
- C - Priority List Project Descriptions of Problems/Solutions
- D - Proposed Binding Commitments – by Quarter
- D1-Projects Budgeted for IUP Available Funds
- E - Public Hearing Summary
- F – Median Household Income by Municipality and County
- G- Sources and Uses Chart (for EPA use only)
- H – Possible Green Technology Projects

# Glossary

---

The following abbreviations are used throughout this document to denote the listed words, terms and phrases:

AgWQLP – West Virginia Agricultural Water Quality Loan Program

BAN – Bond Anticipation Note

CA – West Virginia Conservation Agency

CWA – Federal Clean Water Act

CWSRF – Clean Water State Revolving Fund

DEP – West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection

DWWM – Division of Water and Waste Management, DEP

EBPP – Extended Bond Purchase Program

EPA – United States Environmental Protection Agency

IJDC – West Virginia Infrastructure and Jobs Development Council

IUP – Intended Use Plan

MHI – Median Household Income

NRCS – Natural Resources Conservation Service

NPS – Nonpoint Source

OA – Operating Agreement

OSLP – Onsite Systems Loan Program

POTWs – Publicly Owned Treatment Works

PSC – Public Service Commission

USDA– United States Department of Agriculture

SCD – Soil Conservation District

WDA – West Virginia Water Development Authority

# Preface

---

## **Mission Statements**

### **Department of Environmental Protection**

To promote a healthy environment.

---

### **Division of Water and Waste Management**

To protect, preserve and enhance West Virginia's land  
and watersheds for the safety  
and benefit of all.

---

### **Clean Water State Revolving Fund**

To provide technical and financial assistance to local governmental  
entities to improve water quality and  
public health conditions.

## SECTION I

# Introduction

---

This document is the Clean Water State Revolving Fund's Intended Use Plan for federal fiscal year 2011 (Oct. 1, 2010 – Sept. 30, 2011). The Division of Water and Waste Management is the primary state agency that administers the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, with financial and support assistance provided by the West Virginia Water Development Authority.

As of July 1, 2010, there have been 20 federal capitalization grants and amendments awarded by the Environmental Protection Agency. The state has provided the required 20% matching funds for each grant and amendment, where necessary. Relevant information on these federal grants can be found in Appendix A.

Repayments of prior loans, bonds and investment earnings are also available within the Clean Water State Revolving Fund to fund additional wastewater and nonpoint source projects. A calculation of available funds during FY2010 is contained in Section II.

## SECTION II

# Funds Identification

---

The charts on the next two pages identify the revenue sources that will be used for loans and other anticipated expenditure categories during FY2011.

A similar chart can be found in Appendix G, which is used by EPA for their purpose only. This chart summarizes the federal capitalization grants, state matches, repayments, earnings, etc. since the program began. It also estimates the FY2011 revenue sources and uses to calculate a theoretical amount of funds available.

## WEST VIRGINIA CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND

### Intended Use Plan – Sources and Uses of Funds

State FY2011 (July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011)

#### Available funds as of June 30, 2010:

Cash balance in CWSRF account =	\$86,044,044	
Federal funds accounts payable (Base) =	\$ 9,414,355	
ARRA Grant balance =	<u>\$27,994,163</u>	
		\$123,452,562

#### New funds available during state FY 2011:

Next Federal EPA Grant (FY10 Base funds) =	\$31,762,000	
Next State Match =	\$ 6,352,400	
Repayments (principal) (to 6/30/11) =	\$23,927,879	
Repayments (interest) (to 6/30/11) =	\$ 2,588,732	
Investment earnings (to 6/30/11) =	<u>\$ 115,000</u>	
		<u>\$ 64,746,011</u>
		\$188,198,573

#### Less:

Existing project loans payables (6/30/10) =	\$66,308,484	
Existing binding commitments (6/30/10) =	\$44,916,351	
AgWQLP reserve =	\$ 150,000	
OSLP reserve =	\$ 300,000	
DEP Administration =	<u>\$ 0</u>	
		<u>\$111,674,835</u>

**Net available funds during FY2011 = \$ 76,523,738**

**CWSRF ADMINISTRATIVE FEE ACCOUNT**  
**Sources and Uses of Fees**

**State FY2011 (July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011)**

**Available funds as of June 30, 2010:**

Cash balance =	\$5,106,354
----------------	-------------

**New funds available during state FY2011:**

Projected fee revenue from loans =	\$ 2,078,247
Investment earnings =	<u>\$ 5,000</u>
	\$ 2,083,247

**Less:**

CWSRF FY2011 administrative budget =	\$1,929,632
NPS specialist position =	\$ 70,550
Fiscal Services accountant position =	\$ 69,820
Project WET position =	\$ 92,376
DEP Central Office Support allocation =	<u>\$ 244,060</u>
	\$2,406,438

<b>Projected balance of account June 30, 2011 =</b>	<b>\$4,783,163</b>
---	--------------------

## SECTION III

# Goals

---

### A. Long term goals

#### **1. Expand CWSRF accessibility by creating new financial assistance programs to address NPS pollution control problems.**

Objective 1 – Consider establishing other funding programs within the CWSRF to correct and improve water quality using the West Virginia Watershed Management Framework process.

Objective 2 – Participate in other DWWM and DEP program areas to learn how the CWSRF might be able to provide funding opportunities during the implementation of appropriate water quality management activities, such as watershed assessments, the Chesapeake Bay Agreement, or revisions to the NPS management plan.

#### **2. Ensure the CWSRF program operates in perpetuity at its maximum level to provide financial assistance to local entities.**

Objective 1 – Conduct financial capability reviews on all potential loan recipients to assure credit worthiness and fiscal responsibility.

Objective 2 – Maximize investment opportunities.

Objective 3 – Monitor repayment activity of loan recipients and take aggressive action for collection of delinquent payments from loan recipients.

Objective 4 – Utilize EPA’s financial planning model to ascertain the long term effects of different CWSRF policies.

#### **3. Integrate CWSRF program into DEP’s Watershed Management Framework to increase program effectiveness.**

Objective 1 – Target CWSRF resources toward higher priority watersheds to correct as many pollution problems as possible using priority criteria.

Objective 2 – Assist other DWWM programs in public outreach efforts and assist in developing management strategies.

#### **4. Market the CWSRF program throughout the state to increase commitment of funds and maintain program pace.**

Objective 1 – Continue to provide informational articles on CWSRF program activities.



Objective 2 – Issue press releases on new program activities, developments and financial assistance provided to local entities.

Objective 3 – Participate in quarterly and annual meetings of all federal and state associations concerned with water quality, health and economic development issues.

Objective 4 – Provide presentations at various meetings on the status of the program.

**5. Participate in the monthly meetings of the IJDC.**

Objective 1 – Perform technical reviews on all proposed sewer projects to ensure appropriate technology will be used.

Objective 2 – Coordinate and recommend the most feasible funding sources in accordance with established state rules and procedures.

**6. Incorporate EPA’s strategic plan program activity measures into the CWSRF program implementation.**

Objective 1 - Achieve a targeted fund utilization rate of 100% (cumulative dollar amount of loan agreements divided by cumulative amount available for projects).

Objective 2 – Consider using an integrated planning and priority system to make CWSRF funding decisions.

Objective 3 – Monitor number and dollar value of projects financed with CWSRF loans to prevent polluted runoff from NPS areas.

Objective 4 – Monitor rate of return on federal investment (cumulative dollar amount of assistance disbursements to projects divided by cumulative federal outlays for projects).

**7. Develop effective wastewater management in rural, low income West Virginia communities.**

Objective 1 – Participate in groups to develop wastewater management ideas and programs.

Objective 2 – Encourage changes and increase collaboration at the county level.

Objective 3 – Investigate ways to create new funding opportunities for low income, unsewered communities.

**B. Short term goals for FY2011**

**1. Continue outreach efforts on new potential loan recipients.**

Objective – Each month identify and contact potential loan recipients who have obtained a CWSRF funding recommendation from the IJDC. Monitor the project as it proceeds through the planning and design phases.

**2. Review the current level of success of the Onsite Systems Loan Program.**

Objective 1 – Review the monthly financial reports from the West Virginia Housing Development Fund and other nonprofit organizations that are participating in the OSLP.

Objective 2 – Consider making changes in the program as necessary upon completion of the review.

**3. Achieve the targeted fund utilization rate “pace” goal of 95% in FY2011.**

Objective – Program pace is defined by EPA as the cumulative loan assistance provided divided by the total amount of funds available. Loan assistance is defined as the cumulative assistance provided by executed loan and bond agreements (does not include preliminary binding commitment letters). The CWSRF will do everything it can to convert the existing preliminary binding commitment letters to actual signed loan agreements in a timely manner.

**4. Complete environmental benefits “one-pagers” for all Section 212 and Section 319 loans closed during FY2011.**

Objective – Document the environmental benefits of each project funded using both narrative and data compilation methods. Expected benefits include reduced bacteria levels in receiving streams and elimination of public health hazards within the community. Section 319 projects will be grouped by NPS activity.

**5. Participate in the State Continuing Planning Process initiated by the WVWDA and the Infrastructure and Jobs Development Council.**

**SECTION IV**

## **Project Priority List**

---

The FY2011 Project Priority List is contained in Appendix B. The list includes potential CWSRF binding commitments for Section 212 projects (publicly owned treatment works). A listing of these projects with their specific problems and solutions can be found in Appendix C.

Projects must appear on the priority list in order to receive consideration for a loan/bond purchase agreement or a formal loan commitment. The list was developed using fact sheets received from the applicant, consulting engineer or other representation, and should represent current costs. If additional projects are developed during the fiscal year that do not appear on the list but would like to receive a commitment, they may be added to the list after adequate public notification procedures have been completed. This generally takes 60 days.

The CWSRF will continue to commit funds to POTWs on a first-come first-served basis regardless of its position on the priority list, as long as all applicable program requirements have been met. Further, a POTW will not receive a commitment from the CWSRF unless it has received a funding recommendation from the IJDC in accordance with WV State Code, Chapter 31, Article 15A (see Section III.B.1). This binding commitment from the CWSRF will remain in effect as long as a project completion schedule is maintained.

Individual NPS pollution control activities and projects funded by the CWSRF do not have to appear on the annual priority list. However, the funding of these projects is described in Section V(G) and an amount has been reserved to fund these projects. These NPS projects are allowable for funding using state revolving funds in accordance with federal law and are defined under Section 319 of the CWA. Any type of NPS activities funded must be included in the DEP's approved NPS management plan. Appendix D1 contains a quarterly outlay estimate for all NPS activities expected to be funded in FY2011.

## SECTION V

# Fund Activities

---

### A. Interest rates on POTW loans

The eligibility criterion for low interest loan consideration is still based upon 4,000 gallons of water usage and the definition for a disadvantaged community is the same as it was in fiscal year 2010. The average monthly user rate must be at or above 1.5% of the median household income in order for a community to qualify for a 0% interest rate on its loan.

The DEP will be using this criterion starting October 1, 2010 to determine its interest rate on loans where formal binding commitments have not yet been issued. However, the maximum allowable term of the loans will be determined using the following range of user rates and MHI data:

*Less than 1.5% MHI: 2% interest rate, 1% annual admin fee, 20 year term*

*1.5% to 1.74% MHI: 0% interest rate, ½ % annual admin fee, 30 year term*

*1.75% MHI and higher: 0% interest rate, ½% annual admin fee, 40 year term*

The MHI data that will be used will be the 2000 census data published by the Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Interest rates will not exceed 2% and will not be less than 0%. For all public service districts, the MHI to be used will be the magisterial district that is most appropriate for the project area. Municipalities specific MHI data will be used for them as contained in Appendix G.

Should Congress amend the CWA or pass reform legislation that affects small disadvantaged communities, the DEP may revise this interest rate policy to consider other factors as required by federal law.

**B. Additional subsidization for disadvantaged communities**

On January 15, 2010, FY2010 Clean Water Act Title VI funding was made available to states. West Virginia's allocation is \$31,762,000, or three times the amount received in FY2009. The Appropriations Act requires that a portion of each capitalization grant be used for additional loan subsidization and for funding green infrastructure projects.

The Act requires a minimum of 20% be set aside for funding green projects. This amount is equal to \$6,352,400. The allowable green project categories that will be considered for this funding are described below.

The Act also requires a minimum amount be set aside for providing additional loan subsidization in the form of grants or principal forgiveness to qualifying communities. This minimum amount is \$4,756,940. The Act also allows for a maximum amount to be set aside, which is equal to \$15,856,466. In accordance with the CWSRF state statute, which says in part, "...moneys in the fund shall be used to make grants for projects to the extent allowed or authorized by federal law", the DEP will be setting aside the maximum amount which will be used for providing additional loan subsidies for disadvantaged communities.

Principal forgiveness of all or part of a loan will be the mechanism that will be used to supply the additional subsidization. The criteria for projects to be eligible for additional subsidization are as follows:

1. Additional loan subsidization for disadvantaged communities will only be provided as a last resort when other funding options within the CWSRF program are not practical to make the project financially affordable (40-year loan terms, deferred principal repayments, reduced debt service coverage, etc.).
2. The proposed average sewer rate based upon 4,000 gallons of water usage after project completion must be equal to or greater than 1.75% of the median household income based upon the 2000 census data. The additional loan subsidization provided will be the lesser of 50% of the total eligible CWSRF project costs or \$1,000,000.

3. If the proposed average rate is equal to or greater than 2.0% MHI, then the additional loan subsidization amount will be the lesser of 100% of the total eligible CWSRF project costs or \$2,000,000.

Readiness to proceed to construction will be the primary criterion that will be used in allocating the additional subsidies. A preliminary commitment of the additional subsidization amount will not be issued by DEP until the project has been advertised for construction bids. The final amount of the subsidy will be determined after receipt of bids and after a formal application is submitted.

Loan recipients eligible for additional subsidization must appear on the current FY2011 priority list prior to loan closing.

### **C. Green Projects Reserve**

In accordance with federal law, to the extent there are sufficient eligible project applications, not less than 20% of the funds in the FY2010 capitalization grant shall be used to address green infrastructure projects. A loan subsidization amount not to exceed \$6,352,400 will be reserved for green technology type projects until the 20% requirement is met.

Allowable green project categories will be as follows:

#### **1. Energy Efficiency**

A community may change its current wastewater treatment process to something significantly more energy efficient. A business case that identifies substantial energy savings must be submitted to justify the project. Only the dollar amount associated with the green component of a larger project will qualify for the green reserve.

Proposed green projects in this category will be eligible to receive additional loan subsidization to the lesser of 20% of the total eligible green CWSRF costs or \$500,000.

Projects that will not be allowable include but are not limited to:

- a. Infiltration and inflow pipe repair or replacement.
- b. Purchase of hybrid vehicles for sewer fleets.
- c. Operation, maintenance and replacement activities.
- d. Drinking water related projects.

#### **2. Water Efficiency**

Water efficiency type projects will not be allowable for additional loan subsidization or green technology funding, except for water reuse type projects. Proposed green projects in the water reuse category will be eligible to receive additional loan subsidization to the lesser of 20% of the total eligible green CWSRF costs or \$500,000.

3. Storm Water / Green Infrastructure

Allowable green projects to be funded under this category are:

- a. Publicly sponsored projects that utilize green technologies to treat or eliminate storm water from existing wastewater collection and treatment systems.
- b. MS4 sponsored projects that utilize green technologies to solve storm water issues.

Proposed green projects in this category will be eligible to receive additional loan subsidization to the lesser of 20% of the total eligible green CWSRF costs or \$500,000.

4. Environmentally Innovative

Allowable green projects to be funded in this category are:

- a. Decentralized sewer systems
  - 1. Publicly Owned Systems
  - 2. Privately Owned Onsite Systems

For constructing, upgrading, or repairing septic systems to existing home structures to protect water quality. The project must be sponsored by a local entity eligible to receive SRF funding.

Proposed green projects in this category will be eligible to receive additional loan subsidization of 100% of the total eligible green CWSRF costs.

Based upon the above guidelines and criteria, a list of potential green projects is included in this document. These projects were submitted in response to a DEP solicitation for green projects that occurred in December 2009 with a submittal deadline of February 1, 2010.

**D. Annual administrative fees on POTW loans**

Since 1994, an annual administrative fee has been charged on all loans as a means of supporting the future administrative costs of operating the CWSRF in perpetuity. These fees are maintained in a separate account outside the CWSRF. The majority of the fees is still considered to be “program income” under current federal regulations, and as such is restricted in its use. Funds have been expended from the account since FY1998. In FY2011, the administrative fee account will be

used for all administrative expenditures of the CWSRF. The 4% set-aside allowed in the next federal capitalization grant will not be used for administrative purposes, making more money available for funding projects.

The annual administrative fee is calculated annually using the outstanding principle amount of the loan over its life, but repaid over the term of loan in equal installments as contained in the loan amortization schedule. The chart in Section V (A) above will be used to determine the annual administrative fee on each loan.

The CWSRF administrative budget for state FY2011 is \$1,929,632.

**E. Maximum allowable loans**

In FY2011, there will not be a limit set on the amount of funds available to any single project. This practice will be reviewed annually and may change in future intended use plans.

**F. BAN leveraging program**

DEP is continuing the following option for multimillion dollar projects that cannot reduce its scope to reflect a reasonable cost. A specific dollar amount will be issued by the entity using a BAN for the length of construction period. The CWSRF will commit out of its second round funds a certain amount each fiscal year until the total commitment is equal to the BAN. The loan will then be closed following construction completion, retiring the interim financing. This proposed closing date will also be reflected in the BAN documents. Repayment of the CWSRF loan will begin immediately using the first full Municipal Bond Commission quarter following loan closing.

**G. Extended Bond Purchase Program**

**1. 30-year bonds**

The EPA approval of the 30-year extended bond purchase program on April 13, 1999, allowed many disadvantaged communities in West Virginia to be funded under the CWSRF, resulting in additional water quality improvement projects and providing rate relief to local governmental entities. The more advantageous bond terms have increased the number of sewer construction projects in the state and have allowed better leveraging of other state and federal funds available for sewer projects.

Section 603(d)(2) of the CWA allows local bonds to be purchased by the state at below market interest rates without limiting the term to 20 years as contained in Section 603(d)(1). West Virginia law governing municipalities and public service

districts provides that governing bodies must issue bonds to pay the costs of wastewater projects and sets forth detailed terms regarding interest rates, maturity dates and security provisions and with certain exceptions provides that the term of such bonds shall not exceed 40 years from the date of issuance.

Under the EBPP, the CWSRF will be purchasing local bonds with up to 30-year terms only for disadvantaged communities defined in Section V (A) above. Extended terms up to 30 years will be available to eligible communities meeting the above definition after a request is received from the community and an affordability analysis has been performed to determine what maturity date is necessary (not exceeding 30 years) in achieving, if possible, the targeted rate equal to 1.50% MHI. In performing the analysis, an interest rate of 0% and an annual administrative fee of 0.5% shall be assumed.

Loans closed before July 2, 1999, cannot be refinanced or restructured using extended bond terms unless:

- a) DEP determines that such restructuring is necessary to protect the integrity of the CWSRF;
- b) the financial difficulty is due to unforeseen events (except population decline);
- c) the community has taken all reasonable steps to reduce expenses and increase revenues and such measures have not remedied the financial difficulty;
- d) the community has not discriminated in its payment of debt service on other outstanding debt;
- e) the community agrees to and implements a long term management plan; and
- f) the PSC has approved the proposed restructuring, (if applicable).

## 2. 40-year bonds

In May 2001, EPA approved an extension to the 30-year extended bond purchase program by allowing bond terms to exceed 30 years, but no longer than 40 years. As with the 30-year bond program, offering up to 40-year terms requires that the long term revolving nature of the CWSRF must be protected. The offering of extended financing terms must not decrease the projected revolving level of the fund by 10% or more compared to the revolving level that the fund would have attained if extended financing terms were not available.

In implementing this 40-year program and in consideration of the federal mandates, the DEP established the following parameters that must be met by a disadvantaged community in order to be eligible for extended bond terms greater



than 30 and less or equal to 40years. The intent is to balance the financial need of the community with the long term financial health of the CWSRF.

Facility plans will include additional detailed information concerning expected increases in operation and maintenance costs from years 20 to 40 including, but not limited to schedules for the repair and replacement of all facility units / components, including equipment.

Where there has been a historical decline in population, additional information in the facility plan will be required concerning the composition of the population base, such as age and income characteristics. Other economic indicators, such as trends in tax base, number of jobs and housing starts, may be requested to determine those communities that pose a high risk to the CWSRF program.

DEP's project engineer will conduct an onsite tour of the project area during the facility plan review that will include consultation with local officials as to the purpose, need and financial assumptions on the proposed project.

For revenue projection and rate-setting purposes, the CWSRF will require that only 90% of any new potential customers be used in the facility plan. This requirement will apply during the entire preconstruction phase of the project, including the Public Service Commission certificate case. A copy of the Rule 42 exhibit shall be submitted to the DEP for compliance review with this requirement. This requirement will not apply to existing customers already served by a collection system.

Only disadvantaged communities whose projected average sewer rate exceeds 1.75% of its MHI for 4,000 gallons per month will be eligible for bond purchase agreement terms beyond 30 years but not more than 40 years.

At the completion of final design and prior to the project authorization to advertise for bids, the above information will be reviewed for the purposes of conducting a final financial review.

## **H. Requirements for CWSRF Commitment**

Preliminary Commitments – when the IJDC or another funding agency commits funds to a project that includes CWSRF as a funding partner, the DEP may also commit its funding to the project at that time, conditioned upon program requirements being met in the future as the project proceeds.

Formal Commitments – once it has been determined that a project can realistically proceed to construction within six months a formal commitment of CWSRF funding will be made that may include such terms and conditions as deemed

necessary. Prior to loan closing, the project must appear on the current year's priority list.

## **I. Expanded uses of the CWSRF – Nonpoint Sources (NPS)**

In addition to financing municipal sewage treatment and disposal projects, the CWSRF can finance an array of environmental projects to address NPS pollution. NPS is runoff from areas that have hard-to-trace specific sources of pollution such as farmland and suburban neighborhoods.

As with most other states, West Virginia has devoted the majority of CWSRF funds to the construction of traditional municipal wastewater treatment systems. However, in 1997 the CWSRF funded its first NPS water quality projects through the DEP's Agricultural Water Quality Loan Program in partnership with the WV Conservation Agency. The purpose of the AgWQL program is to provide a source of low-interest financing match funds to implement best management practices that will reduce NPS impacts on water quality. This program is operated in conjunction with local participating banks.

In 2000, the CWSRF began a pilot implementation of its second NPS program titled the Onsite Systems Loan Program. The purpose of this program was to eliminate existing health hazards and water quality problems due to direct sewage discharges from houses using malfunctioning septic tank systems or direct pipes to a nearby stream. This was a cooperative venture between the DEP and county health departments. After several years of frustration, this program was revived in 2008 and is now fully operational. The West Virginia Housing Development Fund and other nonprofit associations are participating in this program to make it accessible to individual homeowners throughout the state.

In creating the CWSRF, Congress ensured that it would be able to fund virtually any type of water quality project, including nonpoint source, wetlands, estuary, and other types of watershed projects, as well as more traditional municipal wastewater treatment systems. The CWSRF provisions in the CWA give no more preference to one category or type of project than any other.

### **1. Agriculture Water Quality Loan Program**

With the initiation of the FY1998 pilot program in five counties (Grant, Mineral, Pendleton, Hardy and Hampshire) DEP addressed nonpoint sources of pollution by the installation of best management practices. The pilot program was a cooperative effort among the DEP, WV Conservation Agency, United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, local Soil Conservation Districts and local banking institutions.

Agricultural producers at the local level work with the SCD, CA and NRCS to develop a conservation plan. A local participating bank then provides a 2%

interest loan for construction that would be monitored by these agencies. The CWSRF loans money to local banks at 0% interest as a mechanism for the banks to reduce their interest rate. During the pilot program, the CWSRF made available \$1.5 million in second round funds at 0% interest for terms not to exceed 10 years. The pilot program ended on March 31, 1998 with 24 loans made to participating banks worth \$313,492. A report was submitted to the EPA in April 1998 describing the overall program effectiveness, results obtained and recommendations.

The DEP expanded this program statewide after securing EPA approval to do so. As of June 30, 2010, more than \$6 million has been loaned under this program for installation of best management practices. Each fiscal year, an additional amount of money is set aside to fund more of these NPS projects. A one-time administrative fee is charged on each loan to cover DEP administrative expenses.

The CWSRF will continue this program in FY2011 with a set-aside reserve of \$150,000 to provide the necessary match to these agriculture grants.

## 2. Onsite Systems Loan Program

An OSLP guidance document is available which explains this newest NPS program. Individual loans are limited to \$10,000 and lender interest rates cannot exceed 2% with terms not to exceed 10 years for the replacement, repair or upgrade of onsite sewage systems.

During the 2007 legislative session, the CWSRF statute was amended to expand the definition of “local entity”, which allows CWSRF money to be loaned to other entities who will act as an intermediary lender in the OSLP. The West Virginia Housing Development Fund was the first entity to enter into an agreement with the CWSRF to provide low interest loans to homeowners to correct failing onsite sewage systems. Other nonprofit associations are interested in participating in this program.

The CWSRF will provide \$300,000 as a set-aside for this program in FY2011.

## 3. Other CWA Section 319 Nonpoint Source Activities

Historically, the CWSRF and other financing programs such as the EPA construction grants program focused on point sources of pollution such as municipal wastewater and industrial discharges.

Nonpoint sources of water pollution, that may include contaminated groundwater flow and runoff from agricultural and developed land, have received far less attention. This is because nonpoint sources of pollution are harder to identify and address, since they are not discrete end-of-pipe pollution sources.

In West Virginia, other nonpoint sources of pollution are identified in the state nonpoint source management plan developed by DEP. We will continue to evaluate the merits of providing funds to other NPS activities.

**J. Federal requirements**

To streamline the program and reduce project costs, all new binding commitments made to POTW projects in FY2011 will not have to meet many federal requirements. As a recipient of federal CWSRF funds, the DEP has to apply these federal requirements to loans equal to the cumulative amounts of all the federal capitalization grants. The DEP has consistently applied these federal requirements to all loans since the beginning of the program in 1991. DEP has met this federal requirement at 130% of what is required. Therefore, many federal requirements will not be imposed on projects in FY2011, such as minority/women's-owned business enterprise goals, presidential executive orders, just to name a few. Recipients of earmark grants from Congress will still have to meet these federal requirements for the entire project, including any CWSRF funds. This will likely continue in future fiscal years.

SECTION VI

## Assurances

---

DEP has provided the necessary assurances and certifications as part of the operating agreement with EPA. The Operating Agreement defines the mutual obligations between EPA and DEP. The purpose of the OA is to provide a framework of procedures to be followed in the management and administration of the CWSRF. The OA includes the requirements of the following sections of the federal Clean Water Act:

- 602(a) - Environmental Reviews – the DEP will conduct the reviews in accordance with state regulations.
- 602(b)(3) - Binding Commitments – the DEP will enter into binding commitments for 120% of each quarterly grant payment within one year of receipt of the payment.
- 602(b)(4) - Expeditious and Timely Expenditures – the DEP will expend all funds in the CWSRF in a timely manner.
- 602(b)(5) - First Use for Enforceable Requirements – the DEP has certified that all national municipal policy projects have met this requirement.

These and other procedures are described in the OA and may be examined by contacting the DEP. The OA is currently undergoing revision due to the many changes in the program since its inception in 1989.

## SECTION VII

# Criteria and method for distribution of funds

---

The following approach was used to update the priority list, intended use plan and projection of the distribution of all funds contained in the CWSRF:

1. Analysis of community and financial assistance needed;
2. Review of project schedule to determine when the project would be in a state of readiness to proceed to construction;
3. Individual contact with potential loan recipient or its representative;
4. Allocation of funds among projects;
5. Development of an EPA payment schedule which will provide for making timely binding commitments to projects selected for CWSRF financial assistance;
6. Development of individual disbursement schedules to pay project costs as incurred.
7. Analysis of NPS activities and the extent to which reserved funds would be needed for such projects, and
8. Estimate of administrative expenditures that will occur during the fiscal year.

## SECTION VIII

# Public participation

---

On September 9, 2010 a public hearing was held to receive comments on the CWSRF IUP for FY2011. The meeting was legally advertised in newspapers throughout the state. In addition, DEP issued a notice of the meeting by sending a mass mailing directly to all potential consulting engineers, regional councils and other interested parties. There was no representation from the general public at the hearing. No written comments were received by DEP.

Appendix E contains the public hearing notice, attendance sign-in sheet and a summary of the meeting.

## SECTION IX

# Agreement

---

The DEP has agreed to provide EPA with information for the environmental results sheets for all loans closed during FY2011. This new documentation is being requested by EPA to better ascertain the environmental results of projects funded under the CWSRF program.

APPENDIX A

CWSRF  
Federal Capitalization Awards  
to West Virginia

---



**WEST VIRGINIA CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND  
CAPITALIZATION GRANT AWARDS as of JUNE 30, 2010**

	GRANT	DATE	FEDERAL AMOUNT	SOURCE FY FUNDS	FISCAL YEAR	STATE MATCH REQUIRED
1	FY90 GRANT	08/31/90	\$20,889,974	\$14,703,579 \$6,186,395	1989 1990	\$2,940,715 \$1,237,279
2	FY91 GRANT	09/27/91	\$31,353,287	\$9,022,678 \$22,330,609	1990 1991	\$1,804,535 \$4,466,122
3	FY92 GRANT	09/30/92	\$9,661,835	\$9,661,835	1991	\$1,932,367
4	FY93 GRANT	09/29/93	\$30,288,852	\$30,288,852	1992	\$6,057,770
5	FY94 GRANT	09/12/94	\$29,962,449	\$29,962,449	1993	\$5,992,490
6	FY95 GRANT	01/27/95	\$37,792,161	\$18,591,309 \$19,200,852	1994 1995	\$3,718,262 \$3,840,170
7	FY97 GRANT	09/29/97	\$41,165,207	\$3,498,858 \$27,952,749 \$9,713,600	1997 1997 1997	\$699,771 \$5,590,550 \$1,942,720
8	FY98 GRANT	09/25/98	\$20,991,267	\$20,991,267	1998	\$4,198,253
9	FY99 GRANT	09/21/99	\$20,993,049	\$20,993,049	1999	\$4,198,610
10	FY00 GRANT	09/21/00	\$20,921,868	\$20,921,868	2000	\$4,184,373
11	FY01 GRANT	09/19/01	\$20,735,946	\$20,735,946	2001	\$4,147,189
12	FY03 GRANT AMENDMENT	01/02/03 09/26/03	\$20,782,080	\$20,782,080 \$77,200	2002 205(g)	\$4,156,416 \$15,440
13	FY04 GRANT	09/28/04	\$20,821,900	\$20,821,900	2003	\$4,164,380
14	FY05 GRANT	03/16/05	\$20,637,300	\$20,637,300	2004	\$4,127,460
15	FY05 GRANT Amendment	09/28/05	\$16,798,100	\$16,798,100	2005	\$3,359,620
16	FY06 GRANT	09/20/06	\$13,650,912	\$13,650,912	2006	\$2,730,182
17	FY07 GRANT	09/26/07	\$16,684,470	\$16,684,470	2007	\$3,336,894
18	FY08 GRANT	09/24/08	\$10,607,850	\$10,607,850	2008	\$2,121,570
19	FY09 ARRA	03/27/09	\$48,873,680	\$48,873,680	2009	N/A
20	FY09 GRANT (ARRA Amend)	08/27/09	\$12,218,420	\$12,218,420	2009	N/A
21	FY09 GRANT	09/30/09	\$10,607,850	\$10,607,850	2009	\$2,121,570
TOTAL =				\$476,515,657		\$83,084,708

**CURRENT CUMULATIVE \$559,600,365**

22	FY2010 GRANT	?	\$31,762,000	\$31,762,000	2010	\$6,352,400
23	FY11 GRANT	?	\$0	\$0	2011	\$0

FUTURE TOTAL = \$508,277,657 \$89,437,108

**FUTURE CUMULATIVE \$597,714,765**



APPENDIX B

FISCAL YEAR 2011  
PRIORITY LIST

---

# STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND

## Project Priority List Fiscal Year 2011

Ranking	Priority Points	Project	County	NPDES #WV	SRF #C544	Description Code	Total Costs	SRF Loan Amount	Binding Date	Needs Category
	175.00	Greater Harrison Co. PSD	Harrison	WV0084301	451-	C	\$15,664,000	\$15,529,000	9/30/11	I, IVA, IVB
	165.00	Lubeck PSD	Wood	WV0032590	453-	C	\$3,860,000	\$1,128,000	3/31/11	IVA, IVB
	165.00	Crab Orchard MacArthur PSD	Raleigh	WV0082309	462-	C	\$4,510,200	\$2,010,200	6/30/11	IVA, IVB
	160.00	Brooke County PSD	Brooke	WV0084182	006-02	C	\$9,822,000	\$2,460,000	9/30/11	IVA, IVB
	160.00	Nitro, City of	Kanawha	WV0023299	273-	C&T	\$6,600,000	\$3,300,000	9/30/11	I, IIIA, IVA, IVB,
	155.00	Logan County PSD	Logan	WV0033821	460-03	C	\$34,948,000	\$8,027,000	9/30/11	IVA
	155.00	Greenbrier PSD#1	Greenbrier	WV0089010	449-	C	\$4,353,594	\$4,293,594	9/30/11	IVA, IVB
	155.00	Logan County PSD	Logan	WV0033821	460-02	C	\$63,103,000	\$16,476,000	9/30/11	IVA
	155.00	Sistersville, City of	Tyler	WV0021814	467-	C	\$940,000	\$940,000	9/30/11	IVA, IVB
	152.00	Claywood Park PSD	Wood	WV0043991	419-01	U&C	\$4,050,000	\$1,925,000	9/30/11	I, IIIB, IVA, IVB
	152.00	Logan County PSD	Logan	WV0033821	460-01	C	\$11,696,000	\$1,479,000	9/30/11	IVA
	152.00	Crab Orchard MacArthur PSD	Raleigh	WV0082309	257-04	C	\$5,250,000	\$5,250,000	6/30/11	IVA, IVB
	150.00	New Creek PSD	Mineral	WV0085456	044-	C	\$5,895,000	\$5,985,000	9/30/11	IVA, IVB

Ranking	Priority Points	Project	County	NPDES #WV	SRF #C544	Description Code	Total Costs	SRF Loan Amount	Binding Date	Needs Category
	147.00	Weston (Turnertown/Butchersvil	Lewis	WV0028088	471-	C	\$5,187,000	\$5,187,000	9/30/11	IIIB
	147.00	Claywood Park PSD	Wood	WV0143991	419-02	C	\$2,213,200	\$713,000	9/30/11	IVA, IVB
	147.00	Delbarton, Town of	Mingo	WV0042374	414-	C	\$10,693,420	\$7,741,620	9/30/11	I, IVA, IVB
	145.00	Greater St. Albans PSD	Kanawha	WV0035068	406-03	C	\$8,704,000	\$7,204,000	9/30/11	IVA, IVB
	145.00	Flatwoods-Canoe Run PSD	Braxton	WV0084042	316-	U&C	\$8,700,000	\$7,000,000	3/31/11	I, IVA, IVB, V
	137.00	Vienna, City of	Wood	WV0023221	469-	C	\$500,000	\$500,000	9/30/11	IVA, IVB
	135.00	Elk Valley PSD (Phase II)	Kanawha	WV0080900	400-02	C	\$15,000,000	\$15,000,000	9/30/11	IVA
	135.00	Enlarged Hepzibah PSD	Harrison	WV0081001	463-	C	\$3,500,000	\$400,000	9/30/11	IIIA, IVA, IVB
	132.00	Sophia, Town of	Raleigh	WV0024422	085-	C	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	9/30/11	IVA, IVB
	132.00	War, City of	War	WV0040371	466-	C	\$2,900,000	\$400,000	9/30/11	IVA, IVB
	125.00	Northern Wayne PSD	Wayne	WV0089621	402-	R	\$2,372,000	\$2,372,000	5/30/11	IVA
	120.00	Moorefield	Hardy	WV0020150	370-	W	\$37,743,513	\$18,083,513	6/30/11	I, IVB
	120.00	Crab Orchard MacArthur PSD	Raleigh	WV0082309	387-01	C	\$15,100,000	\$15,100,000	9/30/11	II, IIIB, IVA, IVB
	120.00	Crab Orchard MacArthur PSD	Raleigh	WV0082309	388-	C	\$10,352,000	\$6,921,000	9/30/11	I, IVA, IVB
	115.00	Pullman, Town of	Ritchie	WV0000000	138-	C&U	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	9/30/11	I, IVA, IVB

Ranking	Priority Points	Project	County	NPDES #WV	SRF #C544	Description Code	Total Costs	SRF Loan Amount	Binding Date	Needs Category
	105.00	Hinton	Summers	WV0024732	391-	C	\$4,004,000	\$1,228,000	6/30/11	I, IVA
	102.00	Pratt, Town of	Kanawha	WV0021784	464-	R&U	\$1,410,000	\$1,410,000	9/30/11	I, IIIA, IIIB
	100.00	St. Mary's, City of	Pleasants	WV0020165	468-	U	\$3,137,000	\$820,000	9/30/11	IIIB
	100.00	Winfield, Town of	Putnam	WV0024503	440-01	U	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	9/30/11	IIIB
	100.00	Kingwood	Preston	WV0021881	450-01	W&C	\$15,995,000	\$14,495,000	9/30/11	I, IIIA, IIIB, IVB, V
	97.00	Mason County PSD	Mason	WV0105619	407-	R	\$6,000,000	\$5,100,000	9/30/11	IIIB, IVA, IVB
	95.00	Charles Town (Design)	Jefferson	WV0022349	392-01	U	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	12/31/11	II
	95.00	Charles Town Phase I	Jefferson	WV0022349	392-02	U	\$15,550,750	\$15,550,750	6/30/11	II
	91.00	Beckley, City of	Raleigh	WV0023183	439-03	C&S	\$4,212,100	\$4,212,100	9/30/11	IIIA, IVA, V
	90.00	Central Boaz PSD	Wood	WV0084221	059-	T	\$330,000	\$330,000	9/30/11	I, IIIB, IVB
	90.00	Harpers Ferry-Bolivar PSD	Jefferson	WV0039136	429-	U	\$4,461,343	\$2,230,672	9/30/11	II
	90.00	Shady Spring PSD	Raleigh	WV0080403	424-	R	\$2,422,826	\$2,422,826	6/30/11	IIIA, IIIB
	90.00	Ronceverte, City of	Greenbrier	WV0023246	267-	R	\$21,276,000	\$21,276,000	9/30/11	I, II, IIIA
	85.00	Weston (Phase II No. Kittensvill	Lewis	WV0028088	404-02	C&R	\$2,217,000	\$992,700	3/31/11	IIIB, IVB
	85.00	Weston (CSO)	Lewis	WV0028088			\$490,000	\$243,650	6/30/11	IIIB

Ranking	Priority Points	Project	County	NPDES #WV	SRF #C544	Description Code	Total Costs	SRF Loan Amount	Binding Date	Needs Category
	85.00	Wellsburg, City of	Brooke	WV0026832	465-	S	\$1,111,250	\$176,250	6/30/11	V
	85.00	Parkersburg, City of	Wood	WV0023213	420-02	R	\$6,229,700	\$6,229,700	9/30/11	IIIB, IVB
	82.00	Granville, Town of	Monongalia	WV0024988	448-	R&S	\$750,000	\$750,000	9/30/11	IIIA
	82.00	West Union, Town of	Doddridge	WV0020109	441-	R&S	\$2,537,000	\$2,537,000	9/30/11	V
	80.00	Huntington, City of	Cabell	WV0023159	461-	R	\$3,090,240	\$3,090,240	12/31/10	IIIB
	80.00	Shepherdstown	Jefferson	WV0024775	159-	U	\$9,127,000	\$8,627,000	12/31/10	I, II, IVA
	80.00	Wheeling	Ohio	WV0023230	351-02	R	\$9,000,000	\$9,000,000	12/31/10	I, IIIB, V
	80.00	New Haven	Mason	WV0032531	430-	W&C	\$3,277,500	\$3,277,500	3/31/11	I, IIIB, IVA
	80.00	Moundsville	Marshall	WV0023264	025-02	R	\$4,638,423	\$3,678,601	12/31/10	I, IIIB, IVA, IVB, V
	77.00	Charleston, City of	Kanawha	WV0023205	379-	R	\$4,954,000	\$4,954,000	9/30/11	IIIB
	77.00	Charleston, City of	Kanawha	WV0023205	270-	R	\$6,814,000	\$6,814,000	9/30/11	IIIB
	75.00	Green Valley-Glenwood PSD	Mercer	WV0082627	017-	R&U	\$1,000,000	\$500,000	3/31/11	VI
	75.00	Richwood, City of	Nicholas	WV0022004	308-03	U	\$8,691,000	\$8,691,000	9/30/11	I
	75.00	Jefferson County PSD	Jefferson	WV0084361	248-	U&R	\$27,549,054	\$26,549,054	6/30/11	I
	72.00	Charleston, City of	Kanawha	WV0023205	272-	R	\$12,120,000	\$12,120,000	9/30/11	IIIA

Ranking	Priority Points	Project	County	NPDES #WV	SRF #C544	Description Code	Total Costs	SRF Loan Amount	Binding Date	Needs Category
	70.00	Point Pleasant, City of	Mason	WV0022039	082-	R	\$4,070,000	\$4,070,000	6/30/11	V
	70.00	Paden City, City of	Wetzel	WV0020613	418-	R	\$5,200,000	\$2,600,000	9/30/11	IIIB
	70.00	Philippi, City of	Barbour	WV0021857	343-03	T	\$3,300,000	\$1,800,000	9/30/11	I
	65.00	Princeton, City of	Mercer	WV0023094	281-02	U	\$8,805,000	\$6,305,000	6/30/11	I, V
	65.00	Ceredo	Wayne	WV0021873	179-	C	\$560,000	\$560,000	3/31/11	IIIB
	63.00	Hartford, Town of	Mason	WV0080527	470-	C	\$1,932,000	\$307,000	9/30/11	IIIA, IIIB
	60.00	Barrackville	Marion	WV0081434	438-	R	\$6,543,960	\$2,500,000	12/31/10	V
	60.00	Pennsboro, City of	Ritchie	WV0025739	409-	U	\$2,091,000	\$443,618	9/30/11	I
	35.00	Greater Marion PSD	Marion	WV0080764	251-02	C	\$5,700,000	\$3,700,000	6/30/11	IVA, IVB

APPENDIX C

PRIORITY LIST PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS OF  
PROBLEMS/SOLUTIONS

---

# STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND

## FY 2011 Priority List Problems and Solutions

County	Project	SRF #C544	Problem	Solution
Barbour	Philippi, City of	343-03	not meeting current discharge limits	treatment plant rehabilitation
Braxton	Flatwoods-Canoe Run PSD	316-	direct discharge; failing septic systems	six new collection extensions
Brooke	Wellsburg, City of	465-	CSO's	Phase I of CSO correction
Brooke	Brooke County PSD	006-02	failing septic system	new collection system
Cabell	Huntington, City of	461-	pumps not working adequately	pump replacement
Doddridge	West Union, Town of	441-	CSO's	Correct CSO's by separation
Greenbrier	Greenbrier PSD#1	449-	failing septic systems	new collection extension
Greenbrier	Ronceverte, City of	267-	not meeting permit limits	upgrade WWTP
Hardy	Moorefield	370-	Chesapeake Bay limitations	new WWTP
Harrison	Greater Harrison Co. PSD	451-	failing septic systems	new collection system
Harrison	Enlarged Hepzibah PSD	463-	direct discharge	new collection extension
Jefferson	Jefferson County PSD	248-	not meeting permit requirements for Chesapeake Bay	new WWTP and interceptor sewer
Jefferson	Harpers Ferry-Bolivar PSD	429-	Nitrogen & Phosphorus too high/Chesapeake Bay	rehabilitate plant to take care of excessive limits of nitrogen & phosphorus
Jefferson	Charles Town Phase I	392-02	need to meet permit discharge limits	upgrade to wastewater treatment plant



County	Project	SRF #C544	Problem	Solution
Jefferson	Charles Town (Design)	392-01	Need to meet permit discharge limits	Upgrade to wastewater treatment plant
Jefferson	Shepherdstown	159-	WWTP capacity and repairs needed	WWTP Upgrade
Kanawha	Nitro, City of	273-	failing septic systems	new collection system
Kanawha	Charleston, City of	272-	inflow/infiltration	Rehabilitate
Kanawha	Charleston, City of	379-	inflow/infiltration	Rehabilitate
Kanawha	Charleston, City of	270-	inflow/infiltration	Rehabilitate
Kanawha	Greater St. Albans PSD	406-03	failing septic systems	new collection extension
Kanawha	Elk Valley PSD (Phase II)	400-02	failing septic	sewer extensions
Kanawha	Pratt, Town of	464-	inflow/infiltration; overflows	rehabilitation to collection system; upgrade to treatment plant
Lewis	Weston (CSO)		CSO's	CSO correction
Lewis	Weston (Turnertown/Butchersville)	471-	failing septic	new collection system
Lewis	Weston (Phase II No. Kittensville)	404-02	Rehabilitate	inflow/infiltration
Logan	Logan County PSD	460-01	direct discharge, failing septic systems	new collection systems
Logan	Logan County PSD	460-03	direct discharge; failing septic	new collectors
Logan	Logan County PSD	460-02	direct discharge; failing septic systems	new collection systems
Marion	Greater Marion PSD	251-02	failing vacuum collection system	replace collection system

County	Project	SRF #C544	Problem	Solution
Marion	Barrackville	438-	CSO's	CSO correction
Marshall	Moundsville	025-02	failing sewers	repair collection system
Mason	Point Pleasant, City of	082-	CSO overflows	separation of storm/sanitary sewers
Mason	Mason County PSD	407-	failing septic systems/package plant	rehabilitated lines
Mason	New Haven	430-	WWTP failing and failing septs	WWTP upgrade and sewer extension
Mason	Hartford, Town of	470-	infiltration/inflow	Upgrade collection system
Mercer	Green Valley-Glenwood PSD	017-	overflows at equalization ponds	installation of pump station, forcemain & two uv units
Mercer	Princeton, City of	281-02	CSO separation/rehabilitation	rehabilitate collection lines
Mineral	New Creek PSD	044-	failing septs	new collection system
Mingo	Delbarton, Town of	414-	inflow/infiltration; failing septic systems	new collection system; upgrade treatment plant
Monongalia	Granville, Town of	448-	storm water infiltration	replacement & removal of storm lines
Nicholas	Richwood, City of	308-03	failing wastewater treatment plant	replace failing wastewater treatment plant
Ohio	Wheeling	351-02	CSO's	CSO correction
Pleasants	St. Mary's, City of	468-	inflow/infiltration	rehabilitation of lines
Preston	Kingwood	450-01	WWTP and collection system failing	Upgrade entire system
Putnam	Winfield, Town of	440-01	old collection system	Upgrade collection system

County	Project	SRF #C544	Problem	Solution
Raleigh	Sophia, Town of	085-	failing septic systems	new collection system
Raleigh	Shady Spring PSD	424-	increase in pump	increase pump capacity; reduce inflow/infiltration
Raleigh	Crab Orchard MacArthur PSD	462-	failing septic systems	new collection extension
Raleigh	Crab Orchard MacArthur PSD	388-	failing septic systems	new collection system
Raleigh	Crab Orchard MacArthur PSD	387-01	failing septic systems	new collection extension
Raleigh	Crab Orchard MacArthur PSD	257-04	failing septic systems	new collection extension
Raleigh	Beckley, City of	439-03	failing septic systems	new collection system
Ritchie	Pullman, Town of	138-	failing septic systems	new collection system
Ritchie	Pennsboro, City of	409-	not meeting current discharge limits	treatment plant rehabilitation
Summers	Hinton	391-	failing septic & WWTP repair needed	new collection system
Tyler	Sistersville, City of	467-	direct discharge	new collection system
War	War, City of	466-	direct discharge; failing septic	new collection system
Wayne	Northern Wayne PSD	402-	failing septic	new collectors
Wayne	Ceredo	179-	inflow/infiltration	collection system upgrade
Wetzel	Paden City, City of	418-	inflow/infiltration	system rehabilitation work
Wood	Central Boaz PSD	059-	WWTP deficiencies	upgrade WWTP

County	Project	SRF #C544	Problem	Solution
Wood	Parkersburg, City of	420-02	reduction in volume & occurrences of SSO's	rehabilitation work
Wood	Claywood Park PSD	419-02	direct discharge, failing septic systems	new collection system
Wood	Vienna, City of	469-	failing septic systems	new collection system
Wood	Lubeck PSD	453-	failing septic systems	new collection system
Wood	Claywood Park PSD	419-01	direct discharge, failing septic systems	new collection system

APPENDIX D

PROPOSED BINDING COMMITMENTS  
BY QUARTER

---



Binding Commitments and Cash Draw Proportionality  
Projects Budgeted for the Federal FY 2010 Grant

Name	Equiv.	Project Scope	Proj Num C-544 ____	Activity Code	State Fiscal Year 2011 (\$1,000)			
					1st Qtr July-Sept	2nd Qtr Oct-Dec	3rd Qtr Jan-Mar	4th Qtr Apr-June
Huntington	N	Coll. System	443	D3		3,869		
Jefferson County PSD	N	WWTP	248	D3			26,484	
Shepherdstown	N	WWTP	159	D3		8,627		
Wheeling	N	Cso Work	351-02	D3		9,000		
DEP Administration	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0
Total Projects and Admin					0	21,496	26,484	0

Federal Share (0.8333)					\$0.00	17,913	22,061	0	39,974
State Share (0.1667)					\$0.00	3,583	4,423	0	8,006
Total					\$0.00	21,496	26,484	0	47,980

Activity Codes

P - facilities planning underway

D - design underway

D2 - design under review at DEP

D3 - design approved by DEP/bidding process next

R - refinancing



APPENDIX D1

PROJECTS BUDGETED  
FOR IUP AVAILABLE FUNDS

---



Projects Budgeted for FY2010 Intended Use Plan Amendment and into FY2011

Name	Equiv.	Project Scope	Proj Num C-544	Activity Code	State Fiscal Year 2011 (\$1,000)			
					1st Qtr July-Sept	2nd Qtr Oct-Dec	3rd Qtr Jan-Mar	4th Qtr Apr-June
Barrackville	N	Coll. System	438	D3		2500		
Ceredo	N	Coll. System	179	D3			560	
Charles Town	N	WWTP	392	D2				18,050
Flatwoods-Canoe Run PSD	N	WWTP+Coll.	316	D2				6,467
Huntington	N	Coll. System	443	D3		3,869		
Jefferson County PSD	N	WWTP	248	D3			26,484	
Moundsville	N	Coll. System	025-02	D2			3,678	
Princeton	N	WWTP	281-01	D2				9,100
Shepherdstown	N	WWTP	159	D3		8,627		
Shady Spring PSD	N	Coll. System	424	D3	2,500			
Wheeling	N	Coll. System	351-02	D3		9,000		
DEP Administration	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0
NPS - Agriculture	BMP	various	N/A	N/A	25	25	25	25
NPS - Onsite	BMP	various	N/A	N/A	300	0	0	0
sub-total					2,825	21,521	30,747	33,642
grand total								88,735

The projects identified above are forecasted based upon the known current status of the project and individual knowledge as to readiness to proceed to construction.

Projects not identified here may also receive a binding commitment if they proceed on a faster pace than expected or receive funding commitments from other agencies which requires a CWSRF commitment.

Activity Codes

P - facilities planning underway

D - design underway

D2 - design under review at DEP

D3 - design approved by DEP/bidding process next

R - refinancing

File/ FY2010 IUP Amend #1 charts



APPENDIX E

PUBLIC HEARING  
SUMMARY

---

## **Public Hearing Summary**

There was no representation from the general public at the hearing. No written comments on the draft FY2011 Intended Use Plan were received by DEP.

The public hearing was conducted by CWSRF management. Those in attendance were Mike Johnson, Rose Brodersen and Kathy Emery.

## **“NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING”**

The West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection has scheduled a public hearing on September 9, 2010, at 1 pm to discuss the **Draft Fiscal Year 2011 Intended Use Plan** for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund Program (CWSRF). A part of the Intended Use Plan is the Fiscal Year 2011 Priority List. The hearing will take place at the DEP headquarters in Charleston in the New River Conference Room (Room #2129). A copy of the draft Fiscal Year 2011 Intended Use Plan is available, and may be requested by calling, writing or sending an email request to the address below. The plan can also be viewed on DEP's web site.

### **Contact**

Mike Johnson  
WV Department of Environmental Protection  
Division of Water & Waste Management  
Clean Water State Revolving Fund  
601 57<sup>th</sup> Street, SE  
Charleston, WV 25304  
(304) 926-0499 Ext. 1611  
[John.M.Johnson@wv.gov](mailto:John.M.Johnson@wv.gov)

APPENDIX F

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY  
MUNICIPALITY AND COUNTY

---



<b><u>Municipality</u></b>	<b><u>2000 Census Median HH Income</u></b>	<b><u>Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.25%</u></b>	<b><u>Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.5%</u></b>	<b><u>Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.75%</u></b>
Addison (Webster Springs) town	20,592	21.45	25.74	30.03
Albright town	21,389	22.28	26.74	31.19
Alderson town	23,043	24.00	28.80	33.60
Alum Creek CDP	40,714	42.41	50.89	59.37
Amherstdale-Robinette CDP	28,512	29.70	35.64	41.58
Anawalt town	13,333	13.89	16.67	19.44
Anmoore town	25,000	26.04	31.25	36.46
Ansted town	25,028	26.07	31.29	36.50
Athens town	27,260	28.40	34.08	39.75
Auburn town	19,063	19.86	23.83	27.80
Bancroft town	28,833	30.03	36.04	42.05
Barboursville village	35,139	36.60	43.92	51.24
Barrackville town	31,587	32.90	39.48	46.06
Bath (Berkeley Springs) town	24,934	25.97	31.17	36.36
Bayard town	25,156	26.20	31.45	36.69
Beaver CDP	25,836	26.91	32.30	37.68
Beckley city	28,122	29.29	35.15	41.01
Beech Bottom village	33,393	34.78	41.74	48.70
Belington town	22,154	23.08	27.69	32.31
Belle town	34,118	35.54	42.65	49.76
Belmont city	27,375	28.52	34.22	39.92
Benwood city	20,478	21.33	25.60	29.86
Bethany town	36,375	37.89	45.47	53.05
Bethlehem village	43,802	45.63	54.75	63.88
Beverly town	21,875	22.79	27.34	31.90
Blacksville town	31,250	32.55	39.06	45.57
Blennerhassett CDP	51,250	53.39	64.06	74.74
Bluefield city	27,672	28.83	34.59	40.36
Boaz CDP	39,250	40.89	49.06	57.24
Bolivar town	42,375	44.14	52.97	61.80
Bradley CDP	28,844	30.05	36.06	42.06
Bradshaw town	12083	12.59	15.10	17.62
Bramwell town	21,979	22.89	27.47	32.05
Brandonville town	28,125	29.30	35.16	41.02
Bridgeport city	49,310	51.36	61.64	71.91
Brookhaven CDP	32,206	33.55	40.26	46.97
Bruceton Mills town	25,625	26.69	32.03	37.37
Buckhannon city	23,421	24.40	29.28	34.16
Buffalo town	26,481	27.58	33.10	38.62
Burnsville town	24,167	25.17	30.21	35.24
Cairo town	24,688	25.72	30.86	36.00
Camden-on-Gauley town	15,417	16.06	19.27	22.48
Cameron city	25,119	26.17	31.40	36.63
Capon Bridge town	30,750	32.03	38.44	44.84
Carpendale town	35,404	36.88	44.26	51.63
Cassville CDP	25,799	26.87	32.25	37.62
Cedar Grove town	23,250	24.22	29.06	33.91
Ceredo city	24,323	25.34	30.40	35.47
Chapmanville town	23,077	24.04	28.85	33.65
Charles Town city	32,538	33.89	40.67	47.45



<u>Municipality</u>	<u>2000 Census Median HH Income</u>	<u>Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.25%</u>	<u>Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.5%</u>	<u>Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.75%</u>
Charleston city	34,009	35.43	42.51	49.60
Chattaroy CDP	31,563	32.88	39.45	46.03
Cheat Lake CDP	48,594	50.62	60.74	70.87
Chesapeake town	29,526	30.76	36.91	43.06
Chester city	28,550	29.74	35.69	41.64
Clarksburg city	27,722	28.88	34.65	40.43
Clay town	14,712	15.33	18.39	21.46
Clearview village	41,250	42.97	51.56	60.16
Clendenin town	32,000	33.33	40.00	46.67
Coal City CDP	28,049	29.22	35.06	40.90
Coal Fork CDP	26,250	27.34	32.81	38.28
Corporation of Ranson town	24,485	25.51	30.61	35.71
Cowen town	21,250	22.14	26.56	30.99
Crab Orchard CDP	29,932	31.18	37.42	43.65
Craigsville CDP	24,631	25.66	30.79	35.92
Cross Lanes CDP	45,334	47.22	56.67	66.11
Culloden CDP	39,135	40.77	48.92	57.07
Daniels CDP	27,955	29.12	34.94	40.77
Danville town	21,369	22.26	26.71	31.16
Davis town	25,221	26.27	31.53	36.78
Davy town	16,250	16.93	20.31	23.70
Delbarton town	21,875	22.79	27.34	31.90
Despard CDP	19,740	20.56	24.68	28.79
Dunbar city	35,117	36.58	43.90	51.21
Durbin town	23,462	24.44	29.33	34.22
East Bank town	35,341	36.81	44.18	51.54
Eleanor town	35,284	36.75	44.11	51.46
Elizabeth town	25,114	26.16	31.39	36.62
Elk Garden town	24,375	25.39	30.47	35.55
Elkins city	26,906	28.03	33.63	39.24
Elkview CDP	35,033	36.49	43.79	51.09
Ellenboro town	22,500	23.44	28.13	32.81
Enterprise CDP	29,583	30.82	36.98	43.14
Fairlea CDP	20,664	21.53	25.83	30.14
Fairmont city	25,628	26.70	32.04	37.37
Fairview town	24,896	25.93	31.12	36.31
Falling Spring town	25,469	26.53	31.84	37.14
Farmington town	29,375	30.60	36.72	42.84
Fayetteville town	35,043	36.50	43.80	51.10
Flatwoods town	29,500	30.73	36.88	43.02
Flemington town	27,917	29.08	34.90	40.71
Follansbee city	30,818	32.10	38.52	44.94
Fort Ashby CDP	32,375	33.72	40.47	47.21
Fort Gay town	14,565	15.17	18.21	21.24
Franklin town	32,125	33.46	40.16	46.85
Friendly town	33,571	34.97	41.96	48.96
Gary city	22,857	23.81	28.57	33.33
Gassaway town	23,009	23.97	28.76	33.55
Gauley Bridge town	22,500	23.44	28.13	32.81
Gilbert Creek CDP	16,625	17.32	20.78	24.24



<u>Municipality</u>	<u>2000 Census Median HH Income</u>	<u>Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.25%</u>	<u>Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.5%</u>	<u>Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.75%</u>
Gilbert town	29,219	30.44	36.52	42.61
Glasgow town	35,526	37.01	44.41	51.81
Glen Dale city	40,000	41.67	50.00	58.33
Glenville town	20,243	21.09	25.30	29.52
Grafton city	21,981	22.90	27.48	32.06
Grant Town town	24,722	25.75	30.90	36.05
Grantsville town	26,111	27.20	32.64	38.08
Granville town	22,583	23.52	28.23	32.93
Hambleton town	23,625	24.61	29.53	34.45
Hamlin town	22,143	23.07	27.68	32.29
Handley town	21,429	22.32	26.79	31.25
Harman town	21,136	22.02	26.42	30.82
Harpers Ferry town	52,344	54.53	65.43	76.34
Harrisville town	28,750	29.95	35.94	41.93
Hartford City town	24,219	25.23	30.27	35.32
Harts CDP	21,703	22.61	27.13	31.65
Hedgesville town	49,375	51.43	61.72	72.01
Henderson town	15,865	16.53	19.83	23.14
Hendricks town	26,705	27.82	33.38	38.94
Hillsboro town	29,583	30.82	36.98	43.14
Hinton city	20,323	21.17	25.40	29.64
Holden CDP	23,510	24.49	29.39	34.29
Hooverson Heights CDP	37,101	38.65	46.38	54.11
Hundred town	25,192	26.24	31.49	36.74
Huntington city	23,234	24.20	29.04	33.88
Hurricane city	39,591	41.24	49.49	57.74
Huttonsville town	22,321	23.25	27.90	32.55
Iaeger town	14,886	15.51	18.61	21.71
Inwood CDP	41,033	42.74	51.29	59.84
Jane Lew town	23,571	24.55	29.46	34.37
Jefferson town	16,384	17.07	20.48	23.89
Junior town	20,536	21.39	25.67	29.95
Kenova city	23,342	24.31	29.18	34.04
Kermit town	31,500	32.81	39.38	45.94
Keyser city	23,718	24.71	29.65	34.59
Keystone city	10,417	10.85	13.02	15.19
Kimball town	17,333	18.06	21.67	25.28
Kingwood city	29,155	30.37	36.44	42.52
Leon town	21,429	22.32	26.79	31.25
Lester town	24,375	25.39	30.47	35.55
Lewisburg city	27,857	29.02	34.82	40.62
Littleton town	15,714	16.37	19.64	22.92
Logan city	22,623	23.57	28.28	32.99
Lost Creek town	26,563	27.67	33.20	38.74
Lubeck CDP	42,614	44.39	53.27	62.15
Lumberport town	33,750	35.16	42.19	49.22
Mabscott town	28,021	29.19	35.03	40.86
MacArthur CDP	29,607	30.84	37.01	43.18
Madison city	29,911	31.16	37.39	43.62
Mallory CDP	24,458	25.48	30.57	35.67



<u>Municipality</u>	<u>2000 Census Median HH Income</u>	<u>Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.25%</u>	<u>Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.5%</u>	<u>Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.75%</u>
Man town	40,179	41.85	50.22	58.59
Mannington city	26,806	27.92	33.51	39.09
Marlinton town	21,293	22.18	26.62	31.05
Marmet city	29,779	31.02	37.22	43.43
Martinsburg city	29,495	30.72	36.87	43.01
Mason town	24,621	25.65	30.78	35.91
Masontown town	22,750	23.70	28.44	33.18
Matewan town	13,529	14.09	16.91	19.73
Matoaka town	17,159	17.87	21.45	25.02
McMechen city	27,179	28.31	33.97	39.64
Meadow Bridge town	23,194	24.16	28.99	33.82
Middlebourne town	28,704	29.90	35.88	41.86
Mill Creek town	24,886	25.92	31.11	36.29
Milton town	29,348	30.57	36.69	42.80
Mineralwells CDP	42,083	43.84	52.60	61.37
Mitchell Heights town	52,500	54.69	65.63	76.56
Monongah town	25,750	26.82	32.19	37.55
Montcalm CDP	20,435	21.29	25.54	29.80
Montgomery city	20,606	21.46	25.76	30.05
Montrose town	33,571	34.97	41.96	48.96
Moorefield town	24,178	25.19	30.22	35.26
Morgantown city	20,649	21.51	25.81	30.11
Moundsville city	23,107	24.07	28.88	33.70
Mount Gay-Shamrock CDP	18,975	19.77	23.72	27.67
Mount Hope city	18,375	19.14	22.97	26.80
Mullens city	27,742	28.90	34.68	40.46
New Cumberland city	28,529	29.72	35.66	41.60
New Haven town	27,008	28.13	33.76	39.39
New Martinsville city	33,750	35.16	42.19	49.22
Newburg town	24,063	25.07	30.08	35.09
Newell CDP	31,343	32.65	39.18	45.71
Nitro city	32,389	33.74	40.49	47.23
North Hills town	83,659	87.14	104.57	122.00
Northford town	16,544	17.23	20.68	24.13
Nutter Fort town	30,163	31.42	37.70	43.99
Oak Hill city	24,792	25.83	30.99	36.16
Oakvale town	22,500	23.44	28.13	32.81
Oceana town	19,273	20.08	24.09	28.11
Osage town		0.00	0.00	0.00
Paden City city	32,940	34.31	41.18	48.04
Parkersburg city	26,990	28.11	33.74	39.36
Parsons city	26,424	27.53	33.03	38.54
Paw Paw town	25,625	26.69	32.03	37.37
Pax town	21,875	22.79	27.34	31.90
Pea Ridge CDP	41,739	43.48	52.17	60.87
Pennsboro city	24,120	25.13	30.15	35.18
Petersburg city	24,867	25.90	31.08	36.26
Peterstown town	23,036	24.00	28.80	33.59
Philippi city	21,528	22.43	26.91	31.40
Piedmont town	21,190	22.07	26.49	30.90



<u>Municipality</u>	<u>2000 Census Median HH Income</u>	<u>Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.25%</u>	<u>Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.5%</u>	<u>Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.75%</u>
Pinch CDP	46,516	48.45	58.15	67.84
Pine Grove town	25,769	26.84	32.21	37.58
Pineville town	31,008	32.30	38.76	45.22
Piney View CDP	26,324	27.42	32.91	38.39
Pleasant Valley city	33,686	35.09	42.11	49.13
Poca town	42,273	44.03	52.84	61.65
Point Pleasant city	27,022	28.15	33.78	39.41
Powellton CDP	23,224	24.19	29.03	33.87
Pratt town	37,500	39.06	46.88	54.69
Princeton city	21,736	22.64	27.17	31.70
Prosperity CDP	31,632	32.95	39.54	46.13
Pullman town	19,821	20.65	24.78	28.91
Quinwood town	21,705	22.61	27.13	31.65
Rainelle town	19,491	20.30	24.36	28.42
Ravenswood city	30,308	31.57	37.89	44.20
Red Jacket CDP	21,364	22.25	26.71	31.16
Reedsville town	32,273	33.62	40.34	47.06
Reedy town	17,000	17.71	21.25	24.79
Rhodell town	17,143	17.86	21.43	25.00
Richwood city	21,620	22.52	27.03	31.53
Ridgeley town	26,016	27.10	32.52	37.94
Ripley city	25,861	26.94	32.33	37.71
Rivesville town	25,700	26.77	32.13	37.48
Romney city	22,261	23.19	27.83	32.46
Ronceverte city	24,400	25.42	30.50	35.58
Rowlesburg town	28,125	29.30	35.16	41.02
Rupert town	20,250	21.09	25.31	29.53
Salem city	16,577	17.27	20.72	24.17
Sand Fork town	30,179	31.44	37.72	44.01
Shady Spring CDP	29,464	30.69	36.83	42.97
Shepherdstown town	40,750	42.45	50.94	59.43
Shinnston city	26,786	27.90	33.48	39.06
Sissonville CDP	36,725	38.26	45.91	53.56
Sistersville city	26,799	27.92	33.50	39.08
Smithers city	20,417	21.27	25.52	29.77
Smithfield town	18,500	19.27	23.13	26.98
Sophia town	26,008	27.09	32.51	37.93
South Charleston city	37,905	39.48	47.38	55.28
Spencer city	19,773	20.60	24.72	28.84
St Albans city	37,130	38.68	46.41	54.15
Stanaford CDP	30,640	31.92	38.30	44.68
Star City town	26,771	27.89	33.46	39.04
Stonewood city	28,000	29.17	35.00	40.83
St. Marys city	30,755	32.04	38.44	44.85
Summersville town	29,783	31.02	37.23	43.43
Sutton town	25,134	26.18	31.42	36.65
Switzer CDP	21,806	22.71	27.26	31.80
Sylvester town	35,625	37.11	44.53	51.95
Teays Valley CDP	53,053	55.26	66.32	77.37
Terra Alta town	25,388	26.45	31.74	37.02



<u>Municipality</u>	<u>2000 Census Median HH Income</u>	<u>Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.25%</u>	<u>Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.5%</u>	<u>Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.75%</u>
Thomas city	22,443	23.38	28.05	32.73
Thurmond town	23,750	24.74	29.69	34.64
Tornado CDP	50,000	52.08	62.50	72.92
Triadelphia town	26,169	27.26	32.71	38.16
Tunnelton town	18,125	18.88	22.66	26.43
Union town	21,797	22.71	27.25	31.79
Valley Grove village	27,813	28.97	34.77	40.56
Vienna city	39,220	40.85	49.03	57.20
War city	16,012	16.68	20.02	23.35
Wardensville town	28,864	30.07	36.08	42.09
Washington CDP	54,483	56.75	68.10	79.45
Wayne town	20,242	21.09	25.30	29.52
Weirton city	35,212	36.68	44.02	51.35
Welch city	19,795	20.62	24.74	28.87
Wellsburg city	27,298	28.44	34.12	39.81
West Hamlin town	19,250	20.05	24.06	28.07
West Liberty town	28,393	29.58	35.49	41.41
West Logan town	23,500	24.48	29.38	34.27
West Milford town	32,250	33.59	40.31	47.03
West Union town	18,300	19.06	22.88	26.69
Weston city	26,690	27.80	33.36	38.92
Westover city	28,659	29.85	35.82	41.79
Wheeling city	27,388	28.53	34.24	39.94
White Sulphur Springs city	26,694	27.81	33.37	38.93
Whitehall town	42,813	44.60	53.52	62.44
Whitesville town	19,250	20.05	24.06	28.07
Wiley Ford CDP	32,017	33.35	40.02	46.69
Williamson city	19,635	20.45	24.54	28.63
Williamstown city	36,344	37.86	45.43	53.00
Windsor Heights village	28,523	29.71	35.65	41.60
Winfield town	51,023	53.15	63.78	74.41
Womelsdorf (Coalton) town	28,462	29.65	35.58	41.51
Worthington town	28,750	29.95	35.94	41.93

<u>County</u>	<u>2000 Census Median HH Income</u>	<u>Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.25%</u>	<u>Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.5%</u>	<u>Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.75%</u>
Barbour	24,885	25.92	31.11	36.29
Berkeley	38,187	39.78	47.73	55.69
Boone	26,912	28.03	33.64	39.25
Braxton	24,746	25.78	30.93	36.09
Brooke	32,414	33.76	40.52	47.27
Cabell	29,088	30.30	36.36	42.42
Calhoun	22,717	23.66	28.40	33.13
Clay	23,025	23.98	28.78	33.58
Doddridge	27,400	28.54	34.25	39.96
Fayette	24,691	25.72	30.86	36.01
Gilmer	23,312	24.28	29.14	34.00
Grant	28,940	30.15	36.18	42.20
Greenbrier	27,445	28.59	34.31	40.02
Hampshire	31,358	32.66	39.20	45.73



<u>County</u>	<u>2000 Census Median HH Income</u>	<u>Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.25%</u>	<u>Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.5%</u>	<u>Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.75%</u>
Hancock	33,296	34.68	41.62	48.56
Hardy	31,647	32.97	39.56	46.15
Harrison	30,755	32.04	38.44	44.85
Jackson	32,213	33.56	40.27	46.98
Jefferson	43,024	44.82	53.78	62.74
Kanawha	33,626	35.03	42.03	49.04
Lewis	26,911	28.03	33.64	39.25
Lincoln	23,553	24.53	29.44	34.35
Logan	24,396	25.41	30.50	35.58
Marion	28,905	30.11	36.13	42.15
Marshall	30,803	32.09	38.50	44.92
Mason	28,123	29.29	35.15	41.01
McDowell	17,981	18.73	22.48	26.22
Mercer	26,719	27.83	33.40	38.97
Mineral	31,103	32.40	38.88	45.36
Mingo	22,949	23.91	28.69	33.47
Monongalia	30,374	31.64	37.97	44.30
Monroe	27,646	28.80	34.56	40.32
Morgan	33,687	35.09	42.11	49.13
Nicholas	26,591	27.70	33.24	38.78
Ohio	31,559	32.87	39.45	46.02
Pendleton	29,632	30.87	37.04	43.21
Pleasants	31,942	33.27	39.93	46.58
Pocahontas	26,180	27.27	32.73	38.18
Preston	27,792	28.95	34.74	40.53
Putnam	42,180	43.94	52.73	61.51
Raleigh	28,020	29.19	35.03	40.86
Randolph	27,108	28.24	33.89	39.53
Ritchie	27,509	28.66	34.39	40.12
Roane	24,864	25.90	31.08	36.26
Summers	21,672	22.58	27.09	31.61
Taylor	26,836	27.95	33.55	39.14
Tucker	26,536	27.64	33.17	38.70
Tyler	29,764	31.00	37.21	43.41
Upshur	27,418	28.56	34.27	39.98
Wayne	28,459	29.64	35.57	41.50
Webster	21,297	22.18	26.62	31.06
Wetzel	30,972	32.26	38.72	45.17
Wirt	29,415	30.64	36.77	42.90
Wood	33,212	34.60	41.52	48.43
Wyoming	23,959	24.96	29.95	34.94
West Virginia	30,108	31.36	37.64	43.91



APPENDIX G

SOURCES AND USES CHART  
(FOR EPA USE ONLY)

---



West Virginia Clean Water State Revolving Fund  
Intended Use Plan - Sources and Uses of Funds  
FY2011  
(for EPA use only)

**Cumulative Sources as of June 30, 2010**

Capitalization Grants (19)	415,423,557	
State Matches (actual)	83,092,815	
ARRA Grant	61,092,100	
Repayments (P + I; 212 + 319)	208,695,514	
Investment Earnings	28,802,056	
Sources sub-total (a)		797,106,042

**Cumulative Uses as of June 30, 2010**

POTW Loan Assistance	710,141,060	
NPS Binding Commitments	16,679,379	
DEP Administration (4%)	14,143,540	
Uses sub-total (b)		740,963,979

**FY2011 Sources of Funds**

Available funds from prior IUPs (a - b)	56,142,063	
Capitalization Grant #20 (FY2010 Funds)	31,762,000	
State Match	6,352,400	
Earnings	115,000	
Repayments	<u>26,516,611</u>	
FY2011 Sources of Funds ( c )		120,888,074

**FY2011 Reserves**

AgWQLP Reserve	150,000	
On Site Loan Program Reserve	300,000	
DEP Administration	<u>0</u>	
FY2011 Set-Asides ( d )	450,000	

Net Available Funds during FY2011 (c - d)		120,438,074
Less existing binding commitments: 7@		44,916,351
Uncommitted funds available:		75,521,723



## APPENDIX H

# POSSIBLE GREEN TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS

---



## FY2010 Green Solicitation Results - Possible Eligible Projects Only

<u>Name</u>	<u>Category</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Cost Estimate</u>	<u>GPR Amount</u>
COMA PSD	Decentralized	Amigo	1,532,400	1,532,400
COMA PSD	Decentralized	Ury	368,000	368,000
COMA PSD	Decentralized	Rhodell	4,750,000	4,750,000
Lewis County EDA	Decentralized	Walkersville system	685,000	685,000
Morgantown	Decentralized	Crown system	1,439,000	1,439,000
West Fork Onsite Coop.	Decentralized	Onsite/Cluster system 4 communities	5,226,705	5,226,705
Winona	Decentralized		<u>2,000,000</u>	<u>2,000,000</u>
			<b>16,001,105</b>	<b>16,001,105</b>
Jefferson County PSD	Effluent reuse	Flowing Springs WWTP reuse of	<u>5,103,000</u>	<u>500,000</u>
			<b>5,103,000</b>	<b>500,000</b>
Bluefield	Energy Efficiency	Eliminate Ada WWTP.	6,714,236	500,000
Moorefield	Energy Efficiency	Composting	2,540,000	500,000
Weirton	Energy Efficiency	Eliminate pumping stations	800,000	<u>160,000</u>
			<b>10,054,236</b>	<b>1,160,000</b>
Beckley	Storm Water	City hall green roof	881,484	176,297
Beckley	Storm Water	Stratton School & judicial Annex	1,995,700	399,140
Berkeley County PSD	Storm Water	Inwood storm water reuse	5,957,405	500,000
Bluefield	Storm Water	Pervious concrete parking lot	832,961	166,592
Huntington	Storm Water	Bioretention pond at WWTP	830,000	166,000
Jefferson County PSD	Storm Water	Green roof and permeable paving	1,301,768	260,354
McMechen	Storm Water	Green Street first flush CSO project	277,000	55,400
Point Pleasant	Storm Water	reduce storm water that is pumped	<u>3,521,000</u>	<u>500,000</u>
			<b>15,597,318</b>	<b>2,223,783</b>
			<b>\$46,755,659</b>	<b>\$19,884,888</b>